

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~SECRET~~

COPY 2 OF 2 COPIES

NOTE: An additional 2 copies
of pp. 16 thru 20 were
excerpted & given to
Mr. Reynolds [REDACTED]

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

30th Meeting

Thursday, 6 May 1954

4:00 p.m.

DCI Conference Room

Administration Building

25X1A

DOCUMENT NO. _____
NO CHANGE IN CLASS ☐
☐ DECLASSIFIED
CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S (C) 2011
NEXT REVIEW DATE: _____
AUTH: HR 70-2
DATE 1 JUL 81 REVIEWER: 029128

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~SECRET~~
CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

30th Meeting

Thursday, 6 May 1954

4:00 p.m.

DCI Conference Room

Administration Building

Present

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick
Inspector General, Chairman

Matthew Baird
Director of Training, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
DC/PP, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
Chief of Operations, Alt. for DD/P, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
DAD/O, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
SA/AD/CO, Alt. for AD/CO, Member

Harrison G. Reynolds
AD/Personnel, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
C/DDP/ADMIN, Alt. for DD/P, Member

Lawrence K. White
ADD/A, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]*
SA/DD/I, Alt. for DD/I, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]*
Executive Secretary

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
Secretariat

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
Reporter

By Invitation:

Members of Task Force on CIA Career Service

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Office of Personnel
[REDACTED], Office of Training
[REDACTED] Office of General Counsel

* Also Members of Task Force on CIA Career Service

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~SECRET~~

. . . The 30th Meeting of the CIA Career Service Board convened at 4:00 p.m., on Thursday, 6 May 1954, in the DCI Conference Room, Administration Building, with Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick presiding . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Shall we come to order?

The first item on the agenda is the minutes of the 29th Meeting. Are there any corrections or changes desired? Hearing none, they stand approved as read.

MR. BAIRD: I would be interested to know whether the Task Force got the kind of guidance from paragraph 3 that they wanted and needed. It's too bad I wasn't on the Task Force.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: They postponed action anyway.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: There are five points in there which if approved by the Board here would stand as the guidance of the Task Force.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: There are five points in there - try and find them. Is that right? (Laughter)

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We spent three days trying to find the points in the transcript.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I assume the minutes are accepted as read, so if anybody disagrees with the instructions to the Task Force they are out of order.

Item 2, report of the Screening Committee on candidates for the Army, Navy and Air War Colleges.

25X1A9a MR. BAIRD: The Screening Committee met - as I think you will remember, you delegated the authority to the Board, did you not? The Screening Committee 25X1A9a had a slightly different composition: Mr. [REDACTED] represented [REDACTED] 25X1A9a [REDACTED] and George Meloon represented Mr. Reynolds, but [REDACTED] 25X1A9a [REDACTED] and I were on the old board. We recommend for the Director's 25X1A9a approval [REDACTED], OCI, Naval War College; [REDACTED] PP, and 25X1A9a [REDACTED], ORR, for the Army War College; [REDACTED], OTR, 25X1A9a 25X1A9a for the Air War College. And Mr. [REDACTED] of ONE to be the alternate for any one of the three where there might be a vacancy, if he is willing to go, to both the Army or the Navy, as well as Air, which he asked for.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Gentlemen, you have heard the selections. Any comments? They stand as submitted.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Does this require the Director's approval?

MR. BAIRD: Yes.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We will prepare a memorandum from you (indicating Mr.

~~SECRET~~~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

Kirkpatrick) to the Director, then.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I am sure the Director will look at it with a large stare in his eye and say, "What do I do? Sign it?"

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is about the only alternative he has. (Laughter)

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: So can't we save him that? The poor guy gets such a mass of paper.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I just signed the Advanced Management Program at the Graduate School, Harvard University. If we could get the DD/A to allow the Director not to sign, it would be all right.

MR. WHITE: This is not a DD/A problem. I think this was considered, I'm not sure by whom, and it was decided - I don't know whether by General Smith - that in the case of the major defense schools such as the National War College and these, that the Director would sign them. I have no feeling on it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Why don't we raise that question at the Director's meeting tomorrow morning and see.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It would only take a half minute and would get it off his platter.

MR. WHITE: I think the Agency Regulations require that.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: This was humanity only.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We don't really give him much choice in the matter. We simply say the Career Service Board has selected these individuals, and give him a place to write his name.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: You might just as well get a lot of blank signatures from him and use them.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I had no particular reason for it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Item 3 on the agenda is the survey of opinion

25X1A9a regarding the career service. Mr. [REDACTED], you had some comments on that?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: This was an impromptu activity which I undertook without prior authorization or guidance. On the occasion of speaking to the BIC, CS, which I do each session, it occurred to me that since the Board was struggling with the problem of this mid-June jamboree, that it might be a good idea if I could get opinions from a representative group of professional employees as to what policies they believed needed clarification, whether they understood what was going on, what they thought of it, and whether the proposed June meeting was a good idea or not. I was amazed to find--if you will look at Part III, which is the 4th page here, lower left-hand corner--that either

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

we have got an awfully good thing or else I am an unbelievably good salesman, because there is a 100 percent agreement by the 75 people that the proposed career service and the way of acquiring it, is a good thing for the Agency. There was only one caveat by one correspondent or respondent, or whatever you call these people technically, who said, "It may be a good thing for the Agency but would it be a good thing for the individual?" I think that is a very good question. But that was the only "free-wheeling" question, as I call it. As you can see from this questionnaire, they had an opportunity to make any suggestions they wished.

Now the point I would like to ask guidance on from the Board is, since this survey was conducted in the BIC course, clandestine services, which meant that 74 percent of the 75 people, namely, 56, are from the DD/P area, with only a scattered representation from the other sides of the house, would the Board like to have a similar survey conducted along exactly the same principles in the two BIC courses which are now going on in the DD/I area? There are two in progress now, and the same presentation and the same survey could be conducted with about 50 persons in the DD/I area. We would then be able to find out, on a sampling basis, whether the views and opinions, on a working level in the Agency, whether the two sides were comparable, were different, or what the differences were. That could be done.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is it really necessary to conduct any more of these surveys? It was my impression in reading this that this contained almost the same material that the Junior Officers told us, that the Womens Panel told us, and that most of us know, and it's sort of a Gallup poll of the things that have come out of the files of my office. And I don't think we are going to get any further. We know most of these things. I think we have a very clear indication of the trend of public opinion in the Agency on the subject of career service. So I just don't see what advantage it would be, unless you think it's a high morale factor for the people taking the courses.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It's apt to be adverse, I think.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think we can reach the saturation point in asking people what to do.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: The one thing we don't know is what the reaction from the DD/I would be to the career service, which I presume we are going to discuss in a few minutes, and I don't believe we know that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think this is fine, but I'd let it ride here.

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Sort of after the fact.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Rud, if you will, look at page 7. Have you referred No. 41 to Colonel Edwards or Dr. Tietjen? Page 7, at the top. (Laughter)

Item 4 on the agenda is the proposed Regulation, "The Career Service of the Central Intelligence Agency." The Task Force on CIA Career Service is herewith assembled to answer any questions.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Are we ready to roll?

25X1A9a MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes, [REDACTED]

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: All right, under 2.a., then, (reading) "...who accept an enduring obligation to devote themselves to the needs of the intelligence service of the U. S. Government...." I assume there the reference to "the intelligence service of the U. S. Government" applies to the Central Intelligence Agency and is synonymous with it, but it seems to me that it could equally be read that it applied to G-2 or the intelligence section of State or AEC, or something of that kind, and consequently might be misread in a document which applied solely to career service in CIA. So I was wondering if the language couldn't be tightened up there?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes, and I also question the word "enduring". I think it is a little superfluous and trite. Simply say "accept an obligation to devote themselves...." I think the implication of it being continuous is very correct and clear throughout, the obligation to devote themselves to the needs of the Central Intelligence Agency and who have the expectancy of a career in the CIA.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: How did that go, Kirk?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: "...to devote themselves to the needs of the Central Intelligence Agency and who have the expectancy of a career in the CIA."

MR. BAIRD: Mr. Chairman, it may save some time if somebody could point out that part of this paper which hasn't already been approved by this Career Service Board. I know we have a deadline to meet, but it seems to me this is the same form that we approved once before.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think this is the first time, Matt, it has ever been put in Regulation form.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is correct. There is no change in content but the form is a Regulation form rather than a Staff Study form.

MR. BAIRD: I just thought we spent so damn much time on this subject over many meetings, and I know that the Task Force has spent months on it. I

SECRET

hoped we wouldn't have to go through it all over again and justify something we had already approved.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think the way to handle it today is to allow every Board member to comment on any items he has on the Regulation itself, rather than trying to go through it paragraph by paragraph. Is that agreeable to one and all?

Dick, do you have any other comments?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Yes, I wanted to ask a question. It isn't clear to me on the second page under d.(1) what the significance of the date of 18 September 1947 is.

25X1A [REDACTED] That is the date following Mr. Forrestal's taking of the oath of office, which technically is the legal date of the beginning of CIA.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Why did it depend on Mr. Forrestal's assuming office? Is that the day this Agency officially became an Agency?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is the official date that CIA began.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think this battle has been fought before. As I recall this came up when they started the tenure program and was fought down to a bloody draw, that officially CIA didn't begin until 18 September 1947, and therefore, regardless of what your antecedents or precedents or ancestors were, CIA service counts only from that date.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is in the Agency Regulations on the longevity program.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I was just curious about it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Does anybody strenuously object to having it start then? Okay, what other points do you have, Dick?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Why not have the Regulation simply say, parenthetically, that the official origin of CIA is as of this date, because probably other people don't know this official date.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: The official date of the beginning of CIA.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That might lend clarity, John.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Page 6 in about the middle of the page - what was the reason for that? (Reading)"...will appropriately represent the several Agency components and no examiner will be selected from a component having operational or career jurisdiction over the individual." In other words, what was the reason for keeping off the Panel an individual who would have a greater knowledge of the candidate than the other people sitting? It seems to me one of the

SECRET

great problems in the Agency is trying to make decisions about what should happen to people you never heard of or heard of only on the basis of the form, and it's darn difficult, is all I can say.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Does any member of the Task Force want to speak to that point?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I think it was purely to assure objectivity, at this stage. I don't feel too strongly either way.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I feel the same way Dick does, that so often we are considering individuals who are simply names and personnel forms, and if somebody from his own office is present on the Panel it seems to me that would be helpful rather than a hindrance. And if there is going to be a lack of objectivity - it would probably be a five to one vote - or whatever number the Panel was - if he was pressing something illogically.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Particularly in view of the point that was decided at our last meeting, that these people would go back to that office, and therefore should have some say in that decision.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Couldn't we just eliminate the last part of that sentence?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: End it after the word "components". Is there any objection to that?

25X1A9a DR. [REDACTED]: I'd like to toss in just one comment, that in one experiment we did the Boards that did not know the individual did the better job of rating than when they had all the information about him and some knew him.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't think this would alter that in any sense. You would have only one individual who would have immediate knowledge.

25X1A9a DR. [REDACTED]: But that individual has a subjective influence on all the others. He knows him and the others don't, and when we know others don't know him we tend to push our views. The office is represented in the sense that the supervisor can be called before the Board for testimony. My own preference is that you would get a better result if you followed the Regulation as written.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I agree with that.

MR. BAIRD: This is certainly one of the points that we agreed on before, although it may not have been in Regulation form.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How does the Board feel?

Red, what are your views on that?

MR. WHITE: Well, I haven't any strong views either way, but I had felt that the man's application would be endorsed by his component, and that

SECRET

his component would certainly, either in writing or orally, appear on his behalf if they were sponsoring him, so that the committee would have the full views of the office from which he came and to which he probably would return.

25X1A9a

I think Dr. [REDACTED] point is a very valid one and that the views of the office are certainly taken into consideration, and obviously if you have a member of the office sitting on the Panel you would already have one vote to take the man into the career service, so that you really start out with one vote to take him in before you even get started.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: Not necessarily, unless these people are to be instructed representatives of their components.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It seems to me we are talking about two different things. I think in any case when an individual is nominated his office will either make an oral or written presentation, but should that also exclude the office from being represented on the Panel?

MR. BAIRD: As a voting member of the Panel.

MR. WHITE: I think theoretically, Kirk, you are probably right, but practically, a Panel member is not going to go out of his way to vote against a recommendation which his Deputy Director or Assistant Director has made.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: There is a consideration here that these people are not being accepted or abetted or approved for a particular office but they are being interviewed for the purpose of becoming a member of the CIA career service, which is an Agency-wide problem. There is no question of going to any other office. They are becoming members of the career service right from and within and as of the office to which presently they belong.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: Presumably how many members will be on the Panel?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: Three.

MR. WHITE: For my personal preference in the DD/A area I would just as soon make my recommendation and abide by the decision of a completely independent Panel. That is my personal view.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: On a five or six man Panel a representative of the interested office would be all right, but if it's only a three man Panel--

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: Of course, the man is being interviewed by the Panel, and the man appears and the Panel interviews him and interrogates him, and the supervisor also appears if he wants to or if the Panel wants him to appear.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: That isn't made clear here.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How does the Board feel? Richard, do you still

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

feel this clause should come out?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Yes, for this reason: I submit that even though this is all the Central Intelligence Agency anybody would agree that the functions that are performed by individuals here, even though they are brought in on a career service basis, cover the whole spectrum. There are very few people in a very good position to know enough about what some other part of the shop does, to make a decent judgment about a fellow's ability for it. As far as the clandestine services are concerned, it doesn't do a darn bit of good to pick a guy that looks just fine and dandy from every standpoint except that he would never be able to lie or to cheat or to steal, or something of that kind. I don't mean to over-simplify this but I do think it has a great deal of validity to have somebody who has to work with these types and who gets a little bit of a feel of the kind of a guy you want to make a determination about, which doesn't mean that an extremely good Panel couldn't make the determination for us, but until everybody has been rotated into every office I think we are somewhat in the predicament of having to specialize a little bit.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Of course, by removing this clause you don't insure that you will have a representative on the Panel.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I realize that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You simply insure that you will not be precluded from that.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It may work out that I may be wrong, but I didn't want anything in there banning it.

MR. WHITE: I hadn't really thought of the DD/A area as a whole being a career component. I mean, that is a pretty big area to exclude, I admit.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] This does not mean excluding the DD/A area, and it doesn't mean the DD/P area either. If a man is from FI it doesn't mean there couldn't be a PP man on the Panel. PP doesn't have jurisdiction over FI.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Then we have a semantical problem.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I agree with Dick. What are components? Is the DD/A area a component, or every staff and division? And who are the "major components" of the Agency? That still baffles me.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: As I understand it, from the Regulations Control Staff point of view, the major components of the Agency are the six components and the others are operating, jurisdictional or career components. But when you are talking about the DD/P, DD/I, DD/A, Commo, Personnel and Training, the term

- 8 -
~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

is "major components."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We need "career" here.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You are putting apples and oranges together there. You have three Deputy Directors with large numbers under them, and three independent offices with proportionately smaller numbers, and to put them all together in the same basket I think is a terrible mistake, semantically or in any other sense of the word.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Say "examiners will be chosen in a manner that will be appropriately representative of Agency interests." Then we can divide and subdivide as we see fit at the time.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think that is an excellent compromise.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: What was that again?

MR. [REDACTED]: Examiners will be chosen in a manner that will be appropriately representative of Agency interests.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Thank you.

Do you have any other points?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Yes, my last one. Perhaps I don't recollect properly on this, but I remember our discussing PER's and various selection forms, and so forth, at one of our meetings not very long ago, and it was my recollection that we decided that we had too damn many forms around here as it was, and that we ought to settle on one which would suit all requirements. I'd like to refer to that and say that if the PER as presently constituted doesn't satisfy the requirement of career selection, that a couple of paragraphs ought to be added to it so that it can be used for this purpose, and not introduce into this already paper-heavy Agency one other form to be filled out.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I agree.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Paragraph 4 of the Task Force's transmittal covers that point.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I know, but I still agree with Dick.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: So do I, but we have nine months in which to do it.

25X1A9a MR. BAIRD: Do I gather from you (indicating Mr. [REDACTED]) that you would prefer to go back to the PER and make it the basis of the one form, or do you mean that we take this Career Selection Report, which in my humble opinion is a damn sight better, and insert in that whatever is required to do the job of a PER as well?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Matt, I didn't plump in favor of either one. I just

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

plumped in favor of ONE form, whichever the experts think is the better form.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Does anybody disagree with having ONE form?

25X1A9a MR. BAIRD: I'd like to ask Dr. [REDACTED] to speak on this. He is the author of this form and he must have some reason for wanting this one rather than another one.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I must say that as a rater, in looking at this form I like it better than the PER because it supplies the adjectives and helps to simplify the problem. I am absolutely convinced - and I sat at this table with everybody who decided on that PER after we had heard from all the experts and it did look like a darn good form, but I swear to God when we put it into practice to actually work with it, it turned out to be a very difficult form to work with. And I noticed in the first rating period the ones I passed on that were made out by others, that we immediately started off with our worst feature, and that is, everybody started with a different point of view. There were those who had the word "outstanding" in the first paragraph every time, and if you attempted to use a more moderate adjective they said, "This is what the Army does, and you've sold me down the river." So it may be this type of form is probably the answer to this painful problem, where you set down the adjectives and just check them off.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: This is a much better form.

25X1A9a MR. KIRKPATRICK: Dr. [REDACTED], do you want to speak on the subject of forms?

25X1A9a DR. [REDACTED]: I should like to start out by saying that the one thing we can depend on in the rating field is the disagreement and the controversial and the sensitive nature of the evaluation problems. Now I might say that the use of the form we propose will not seem as good after you have used it as it does now.

The second point about these ratings is that any system that you use does not provide half as much information as one would like to get. There are a number of reasons for this. The first one is that people don't like to rate, and the attitude of the rater is a highly significant matter to take care of in this. Secondly, our policies with reference to how rating procedures and forms are handled generally work to defeat the purpose of the form. For one thing, there are too many people who get to know what is in them. People get to feel there are many too many arbitrary actions taken in the preparation of the form. So the policies on how they are going to be used and the people that can see

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

them and use them legitimately, have to be fairly well determined. If some of those policies are correct the attitude of the rater may change and then almost any form might work.

The third thing that my own experience has brought me is that most rating forms make the error of trying to do too many things. Now I am in hearty agreement that we do not want too many pieces of paper, and we don't want too many pieces simultaneously, particularly, but I am of the opinion that if we quit trying to shoot at all of our personnel problems with a single piece of paper and have pieces that are aimed specifically to get information that you want for a specified purpose, which might mean you would have ten personnel forms or rating forms in the Agency, used at different points in the individual's career as CIA's interests in him change. Now when a man first comes aboard what you are interested in finding out is, is he good enough to keep? So the first thing you go after is an evaluative form. If you combine that with the type of personnel form which is aimed at helping the supervisor deal with this individual you introduce incompatible elements, in my opinion, so that the rater does neither job well. For example, from an evaluative point of view in the DD/P we may have a case officer who gets the information and he organizes it perfectly and comes up with the correct action. That man may not be able to add sufficiently well so you have to attach to him an administrative assistant to keep his accounts clear. But he is worth it. From an evaluative point of view you would rate him high on the scale, but from an assignment point of view and supervisor point of view you would note the particular weakness. Now asking the supervisor to do those two things at the same time gets him wavering between two points of view, and in my opinion he doesn't do either job well. So I would rather separate the evaluating job from other personnel functions forms. In my philosophy I would like to carry it still further, I would like to see a rating system which changed throughout the individual's career, depending on what you wanted to know. First, you want to know whether to keep him. Second, you want to see whether he should be selected for this junior career development program. It seems to me there is some information that might be included in later forms, in terms of that selection. Finally, after a man has been aboard a long time and you know that you would never dismiss him from the Agency and he has earned his keep, unless he commits some specific sin or specific act that you could take care of by a specific letter or charge, and you are interested in finding out where he can best be assigned, so you want all kinds of strengths

~~SECRET~~

and weaknesses that have nothing to do with whether he is going to be kept or how good he is, but where he will serve the Agency best. I think that philosophy is one of the ways by which we can improve our system. But I am quite confident that if we repeat all of the errors of the past every time by trying to get one piece of paper to do everything, we won't get the improvement we are looking for. We may not get it my way but I am damn certain we won't get it the other way.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: May I speak about this? I don't have any question that

25X1A9a

technically and professionally, Dr. [REDACTED], you are absolutely right. But, as a practical matter, we have two related but separate considerations here. Consideration one, which is a highly practical one, is that for several years we didn't have any rating system in the Agency at all. We tried to reinstitute one but there are still lots of staff members in this Agency who have never had any rating forms made out on them in recent years. So we have to get this thing started again. In the DD/P we have the problem of rating people overseas as

25X1A6a

well as in Washington. The job of getting these forms out to [REDACTED] and all the rest of the places, and getting them filled in and sent back on a continuing basis, is no mean problem, it's purely administrative but it's no mean problem because in the practical aspects of life it plain just doesn't happen. As a result, it seems to me our first job is to get our people rated, to get some idea of who we've got, what kind of people they are, and so forth. Now maybe five years from now we may be selective about this, but we have a lot of catching up to do and if we don't catch up with one simple form I submit the Station Chief in a small station who has three guys working with him is going to come up with something pretty silly indeed. If it was entirely a Washington problem I would support you to the hilt, where you can go around to the supervisor and say, "We want this kind of a report on Joe Blow", and, "We want this kind of a report on Nelly Smith", and you can go back and check up on it, but as far as the field is concerned it is an impossibility.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And furthermore, I think it would be extremely unfair to rate the Washington people on one form and the field people on another form. It has to be standard across-the-board. I think, Ed, you put the finger on it when you said that rating people is a very unpopular task for supervisors. I know, speaking for myself, I usually take it out of this folder and put it over here in this folder, and procrastinate until finally my conscience gets the

25X1A9a better of me or Miss [REDACTED] comes around and says, "Where are the PER's for

SECRET

your Staff?" Consequently, it seems to me that in this instance discretion is the better part of what we want to do, and I would recommend, seeing that we have a good form in the CSR - I would hate to see it tampered with at this particular stage to try and add other elements, because it would be like trying to take a Swiss watch apart, and you would see the main spring go flying back there in the draperies. So let's adopt the CSR and waive the PER pro tem, not abandon it but waive filling it out, and get the CSR filled out.

MR. BAIRD: Harry, in the first three years would the CSR suffice for your purposes?

MR. REYNOLDS: I don't know why not.

MR. BAIRD: After the first three years if this form is no longer suitable we could go to a better "PER", for the sake of terminology, so that we would still never have more than one form for this particular purpose.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I would like to waive the PER now for everybody.

MR. BAIRD: I tried to meet Dick's proposition that you don't have two forms for the same person.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We also don't want to send two forms for two different kinds of people to the same field station.

MR. BAIRD: So that would do for the first three years.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: And also for the people over three years.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In other words, what I am saying, Matt, is let's take the CSR and put it on a trial basis but let's adopt that as the standard form across-the-board for everybody in the Agency to fill out, and when, as and if everybody in the Agency has one filled out, then let's reconsider if there should be additional forms or other types of forms, and I am sure we won't have to consider that this year.

MR. BAIRD: I was just afraid that we would have two forms on the same individual.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Then these will be filled out when the normal PER's become due?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Let's say starting 1 July we abandon the PER and go on a CSR basis.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Does anybody disagree?

25X1A9a MR. REYNOLDS: I have no disagreement, but [REDACTED] just pointed out to me there is a mechanical gap unless some changes can be made to fit it in so this can be used as a PER for those already in the Agency who have been

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

here for more than three years. As I understand it, this will be added to so that it can be used as the PER.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Ralph, what is wrong with this? What doesn't it have that the PER has?

25X1A

██████████ This is a selection form. We don't need a selection form for people who have been here longer than three years.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is the word "selection" bothering you?

25X1A9a

MR. ██████████: Both the title and--

25X1A9a

MR. ██████████: Don't change this internally because, as you say, Kirk, the spring will go charging up into the underbrush if you do.

25X1A9a

MR. ██████████: Why don't we just change the title?

25X1A9a

DR. ██████████: The adoption of a single form is consistent, for serving this particular purpose, is consistent with my own philosophy. I would also urge that the Board consider the possibility of developing a merit rating system which comes more nearly to meeting all the problems of the Agency than this form does or was designed to do, because it was designed primarily to get an evaluation of an individual for purposes of a specific kind of personnel action.

25X1A9a

MR. ██████████: But it is a much more valuable form for all purposes.

MR. BAIRD: This may be better than the PER if we want something to take the place of the PER, but for selection probably we can get a better one than this.

25X1A9a

MR. ██████████: This is not a panacea for all our ills but it's better than the PER as it stands now.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How many of these forms were run off?

25X1A9a

MR. ██████████: We had a trial run of 500.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: So if we change the title you are not going to throw away a lot of forms.

Now what other changes should be made in this?

25X1A9a

MR. ██████████: May I suggest, before we absolutely sign off on this, that you get the Task Force to look at this critically on exactly what changes should be made, and come back next week with it?

MR. WHITE: I would strongly endorse that. It seems to me that just to expedite things we are about to adopt something without being sure this is exactly what we want.

25X1A9a

MR. ██████████: We can do this in a week.

~~SECRET~~

MR. BAIRD: And the Regulations already exist on the PER.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then I would recommend the Task Force examine this report toward the goal of coming back next week with the report amended so that it can be adopted as the one, standard form for general use, to be effective as of July 1st. And just so we can clean it up all at once, were there any changes necessary in the existing Regulations to make that effective?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: May I make a trade with you on this, Kirk? That is quite an undertaking, because aside from this PER angle how about the Regulation? In other words, is the Regulation okay aside from this evaluation aspect? Can we settle that one?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It was Dick's final point to raise the question of the form. Now is there any other discussion of the form before we go on back to the Regulation?

John, do you or Ted have any other points on the Regulation?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: On the Regulation itself--

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: There is one point that [REDACTED] called me on, on 25X1A9a staff agent and staff employee.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Wherever it says staff employee here simply have it read "staff employee and staff agent" - because a staff agent in the DD/P is just a staff employee off in the boondocks.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: The Task Force can re-examine this.

MR. [REDACTED]: You can say "staff personnel".

MR. [REDACTED]: "Staff employee", from a legal point of view covers "staff agent". The word "staff agent" is deliberately omitted here for security reasons, so that if the Board wishes the classification of this could be downgraded so that it could have wider distribution and use. Isn't that

25X1A9a correct, John (indicating Mr. [REDACTED])?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Just so that would be clear.

MR. [REDACTED]: They have to see something. They haven't seen anything yet. I think maybe the use of the term "personnel" there, rather than "employee", would do it.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: But "staff personnel" is a new term and that gets us into technical problems. Everybody knows what a staff employee and staff agent is. Why not go back and include "staff agent" and classify it "SECRET"? That is the only safe way to do it. "Staff personnel" is not a technically defined term in the Regulations, and consequently you get into another area of uncertainty.

SECRET

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Staff employee is.
 MR. [REDACTED] It's inclusive, legally.
 MR. [REDACTED] A staff agent has everything a staff employee does. We do have two separate categories, but we are relying on that definition of "staff agent" to give them this right.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] People don't understand the legalities of things, and when they read this they are going to say, "Well, I'm out again."

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Why isn't "staff personnel" correct?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Technically there is no such thing.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We could create it today. That would include staff agent and all personnel.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] To put staff agent back in is the simplest way to do it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think we are jousting with windmills.

Red, do you have any comments?

MR. WHITE: No.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Gene?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I worked very closely with the Task Force on this. The main mechanism of the examining panels, etc., doesn't go into effect until 1957.

MR. REYNOLDS: I have some comments to make, Kirk, because I think that it wouldn't be fair to the Agency if I didn't state that while I am going into this thing as AD/P with my eyes completely open, I am at a disadvantage because I don't know what has been in existence in the two years prior to my coming down here. I fully recognize, as I feel sure you all do, that this is creating a group of first and second-class citizens, and we know it. There it is, right there. I would like to point out what I believe and am afraid is going to happen, and we would be prepared to face.

On page 2, the policy of a. here, we say (reading): "Personnel selected for membership will be afforded, within the framework of applicable laws, preferential consideration or opportunity to advance their careers in the CIA by utilizing the benefits and facilities now and hereafter provided for members of the Career Service including promotion, tenure, training, rotation or assignment, and other programs designed to improve their value to the Agency." Now I think we should take a look at what the benefits are and what the effect will be when this becomes fully operative. Now insurance is the same for both first and second-class citizens. That is all right. They can take anything they want. Retirement is the same, depending upon such legislation as the

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

Government may pass. At the present time promotion is the same, but it won't be - those who are not in the career service are probably going to sit in their grade for a considerably longer time, and some of them will unquestionably leave.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But whose fault is that?

MR. REYNOLDS: Theirs, if they don't sign up. I am not making any statement as to what is good or bad, I am simply facing certain facts which I think we should all face.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The only comment I want to make, Harry, is that this particular subject as to the effect that the establishment of a career service would have, based along these lines, I would conservatively estimate has been the subject of at least ten full Board discussions, going into all of the factors, and as to the feeling of those who weren't in the career service, etc. The obvious thing to my mind, particularly in this day and age in Washington, that this will mean to people and that probably will be a key factor in their decision as to whether they sign the application or not, will be that should a reduction-in-force be implemented the career service will be the hard nucleus which will not be hit until after the non-career service people have been hit.

MR. REYNOLDS: Kirk, that is all true, but I wish you would bear with me for five minutes so that I may get off my chest my own feelings on this if I have to administer it, which I presumably will have to do, and the elements that I think are going to be very, very troublesome.

Now I know you have all talked about it, but I haven't, and I would like to make these statements, if I may. When you come to tenure and reduction-in-force certainly your nucleus will be the CIA career people, but you will have people who are not CIA career service people, who have not signed up, who have been here a long time, and they are going to go right smack on their rights to the Civil Service, and we are going to have some difficulty. Now we have to face that. When it comes to training it's service for all in certain phases of it, but in other phases only those career service people will get the type of training they ought to get and possibly the others will be ignored. For assignment it's obvious that the career service people will get the best assignments. Now this has all been faced, I realize it, but what are we going to do with the say 20 percent who don't sign up? If I were one of those 20 percent I would prepare to leave the Agency. Now can we afford to lose 20 percent of these people? From the security standpoint I talked this over with [REDACTED]

~~SECRET~~

to get his slant on it. The morale factor creates a security factor because you have discontented alumni of the Agency stepping out. Now I just want you all to realize that I know all these things, and know that we are going to face them, and when this Board ceases to exist and the new Board comes into effect there is going to be trouble. We are going to have it just as sure as we are sitting here, with a second-class group of people.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: You mentioned 20 percent. The best we have been able to sound out in the DD/I area, I would be surprised if one percent failed to sign up.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Whaaaaaaat?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: When they're sitting quietly in Washington they're not particularly worried about going overseas.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I heard Sheldon and Amory at meeting after meeting just go up and down the walls on this issue. Somebody's wrong, that's all, about the state of mind in DD/I.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are you counting the professionals only or all personnel?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: All personnel.

MR. [REDACTED]: It couldn't be.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would say between 20 and 40 percent.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is why I wanted to poll them and find out what the opinion in the DD/I was, because we don't know and have no indication.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: There is only one issue, Harry, when we face up to the hard nut of this: Of all the people, whether it's five percent or twenty percent or forty percent that would not sign, I would say that the large majority, if not almost all of those who would not sign, it would be solely because of the overseas duty or being moved elsewhere. I think that probably is the one single issue which would divide right down the middle. Now Kirk and Rud and Matt and I, certainly, and maybe others, have been in on innumerable discussions on that subject and we usually end up at just about that same point. The Agency is faced, it seems to me, with a very simple alternative which has to be determined and which we have tried to determine: We either strike out this business that "I promise to serve anywhere, any time and in any way" - leave that sentence out and leave all of the rest in and make career service in the Agency almost one hundred percent; or, we decide that it is only those who are willing to serve everywhere, and sign the thing in good conscience.

Now I can imagine that you could debate this thing for hours as to which of those alternatives is proper. There are things to be said, certainly, in favor of both. The question of the elite corps, which always comes up when you divide people, no matter how you divide the blues and the pinks or the reds and the greens, it's an issue that has been fought up and down. We are all against it but we find ourselves forced into it by the force of circumstances. It may well be that on the basis of the points you raise, your responsibility in this matter, the fact that your heart has to be in this, the difficulties that may beset the Agency, a difficult time for it in Washington, may dictate that we will have to have a look with the Director at the precise measure of this issue of dissatisfaction, and maybe we would have to go back to alternative one that I mentioned - I don't know - but certainly this is the point that has to be faced, despite all our previous conversations. But I feel myself that it is the point at which the most senior people in the Agency have got to set aside an hour sometime, someplace, and actually contemplate and face the issue.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Matt, you can check me on this, I think this is a factual statement, at the last three quarterly orientation courses where the total attendance, I would guess, runs between 15 and 18 hundred, I have made the statement in discussing career service, that individuals have an obligation to the Agency just as the Agency has an obligation to them, and that the Agency expects of its people that they will serve when, where and how the Agency wants them to serve, personal factors being taken into consideration and full realization being given that the Agency would utilize them where they are most valuable. To my knowledge there has not been a single play-back, a single question on that, or a single repercussion from people who heard that, and there were 1800 who heard that statement made. Not one said, "Mr. Kirkpatrick, I don't like this"; or, "I'm going to talk to Senator McCarthy"; or, "It sounds like Russia"; or, "I'm going to quit." Now if you told that to 1800 and not even got one person to stand up to say, "That sounds bad to me", I just wonder if we aren't expanding this situation beyond its true meaning.

The other point I would like to make is simply to say I don't think I would care to be party to a career service program or to advocating a career service program which did not require obligations on the part of the employee. I do not think it would be fair to call it a career service program if it was a one-way street where we gave the employee everything and asked for nothing

SECRET

in return, and I think you would get a very strong Congressional reaction to that, because the Congress itself put the obligations on the military services, and if you recall in discussing this one of the reasons we thought we would put these obligations on them ourselves, is simply to forestall any possibility of the Congress requiring them. Harry, we even discussed going so far as to prohibit persons from resigning, but as civilians you couldn't very well do that, even though you could for the military services.

MR. REYNOLDS: I want to make myself perfectly clear on this. Naturally I wouldn't be in this job if my heart wasn't in it. I fully realize that the career service program is part of the operation of a sound personnel program. I simply wanted you all to clearly understand that I recognize that these things may occur and they may be serious, and we cannot go into it with our heads in the sand. I personally would like to have every person who enters on duty in the Agency sign this paper. I think that is the two-way street part of it, and I think it ought to be made a prerequisite to employment that you sign this paper. I hope we are going to get to that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I do, too.

MR. WHITE: One of the problems Harry is talking about, and which I guess everybody has been aware of, you may well find, when you face the showdown, that your second-class citizen in some cases has more rights than your first-class citizen.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Sure, they are less restricted.

MR. WHITE: Because of Veterans Preference or Civil Service status or something else, and short of legislation you may well face a case where your second-class citizen has more rights than your first-class citizen has.

MR. REYNOLDS: With the recognition that I have given you of my feeling on this situation, there is one part of the paper which I think weakens my own position very much, if it isn't somewhat changed. That is under 5.a., the responsibilities of the AD/P. I think that instead of "The Assistant Director for Personnel has over-all responsibility for reviewing the effectiveness...." it should be that he directs the selection program, because you may get caught in a situation like that which occurred sometime ago in a similar circumstance where the AD/P was out-voted by a Board, and his entire authority was wiped out, and it had to be taken to General Smith so the circumstances could be checked. You see, these boards are going to vary, and you may not always get the people on these boards that thoroughly understand the program

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

or the responsibilities of an officer in the position that the AD/P is in, in this thing.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any views on this?

MR. BAIRD: It seems to me Harry has a good point there, because somebody has to "direct", and if we have not spelled out who does direct I think we should. It has been our understanding right along that the selection program is part of the personnel policy which is directed by the Assistant Director for Personnel, and therefore I think that part of it should also be his responsibility.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: Isn't that covered by saying that the AD for Personnel "....will ensure that the program is administered...."

MR. WHITE: That covers it, certainly, to my mind. I think we all look to the AD for Personnel to direct it. But if that wording would make Harry happy it certainly would be all right with me.

MR. REYNOLDS: I am thinking of an occasion - Dick brings up the point about taking countless things to the Director. Now this is a case where one of his assistants should accept this responsibility to straighten it out.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any disagreement on the sentence reading: "The Assistant Director for Personnel is responsible for directing the program herein established"?

Are there any comments on this?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I have one further word - to be sure the Recording Secretary amends Tab B in accordance with the change we made.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any other comments?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I wanted to comment briefly on an obligation that I think we are all aware of, and which Bob Amory spoke about, that we have got to use care in the education of our people in creating an understanding of what we are talking about.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: There is no question about that.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: We don't think we are taking a great risk. We think we will get a good compliance if it's properly understood.

MR. BAIRD: I feel that way, too. I think you are right in bringing up these points. I don't think people need to be called "second-class" citizens. Take the case of anybody who has a parent, a father or mother they have to look after, and they can't move them - if the office concerned with that employee knows that that is the situation and that is the only

barrier in the way of that person signing up for the career program that person will get everything in the way of career benefits even though he or she may not actually sign the statement. If the office handles its responsibilities, and the supervisory chain of command, what won't that individual get? If the office takes care of that individual he will be considered for promotions, and he or she will have tenure. In all training requests there are mitigating circumstances which are taken into consideration; there are rules of guidance. Rotation or assignment is the same way, except that the rotation within the office is going to be determined by that office head who will know the reason that the employee can't sign up for the career service is because he or she is tied to Washington or Boston, or wherever it might be. That will have to be handled properly, and I think your office has that responsibility (indicating Mr. Reynolds), to show them that this isn't going to work against them.

MR. REYNOLDS: Well, I would be very, very happy if it were 99 percent and that the one percent didn't sign it for other reasons, because I think that is the answer. And I think we should give serious consideration to recommending to the Director that this paper be made a part of a document everybody signs from now on out when they enter on duty.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Mr. Reynolds, that has been discussed a lot by the Task Force, and the reason it has not been put in as an EOD procedure is that the person who enters on duty, by reason of security and all that sort of thing, can't be expected to know what he is buying. This is the argument for not having it, that you can't ask him to sign this and know what he is signing until he has been on duty for a year, at least, so he will know what CIA is all about.

MR. REYNOLDS: I can't believe that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Why can't he be given the opportunity to sign it, with a statement to the effect that he does not have to sign at that moment if he doesn't want to.

MR. BAIRD: In effect the JOT signs just this. Now there is nothing in the world that is going to make you hold him if he doesn't want to stay. But when he agrees to come into the Agency under the Junior Officer Trainee Program he agrees to all of this, but does not really know what he is agreeing to. But I think legal counsel will say that if he changed his mind at a later date, there is nothing we can do.

MR. REYNOLDS: This isn't an oath. This is an agreement to serve, when you come into this Agency, anywhere, at any time, and in any job, which is a

~~SECRET~~

perfectly normal oath to take.

MR. BAIRD: Except that you don't know the nature of those jobs.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: The Task Force did discuss this point and agreed that certainly the whole process should be made known even in the recruiting process. So while we didn't specify signing this particular document, the thought you have is still there. We certainly agree that it must be there, that we shouldn't suddenly confront a guy, after he has given up a job somewhere or come from a college, and say, "This is what we are going to do with you."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: This document is unclassified so it can be discussed with persons not yet cleared, in the recruitment process.

MR. REYNOLDS: I just hope and pray we don't lose anybody.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any other discussion of this Regulation?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: This would be a Regulation which it would be appropriate for the Director to sign.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The Director not only must sign but must approve it, because this is a major policy step to be taken, and he, too, will hear if there are any repercussions.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Verily.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any other questions? We stand adjourned.

. . . The Meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m. . . .

23
~~SECRET~~